BM 695
.N5 D4
1905
Copy 1

ראש השנה
ויום הדין.

The New Year's Day
AND
Day of Judgement
of the Jewish Calendar

BY

S. N. DEINARD, A. M., Ph. D.

Rabbi Cong. Shaare Tov of Minneapolis, Minn., and Ass't Professor of Semitics at the University of Minnesota.

[1905]

BM695
.N5D4
1905

MONOTYPED AND PRINTED BY

MINNEAPOLIS CO-OPERATIVE PRINTING CO.

108-110 THIRD STREET N., MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Gift
Amos S. Deinard
March 9, 1936

C. Gi. 11 S36

THE NEW YEAR'S DAY AND DAY OF JUDGMENT OF THE JEWISH CALENDAR.

THE first and the tenth of Tishri are the most solemn and most sacred days of the Jewish calendar. The first of Tishri is not only the Jewish New Year's Day, *Rosh-hash-shana*, but also the annual Day of Divine Judgment, *Yom haddin*. It is on this day that God examines the accounts of all mortals and issues decrees and judgments, declaring some righteous and worthy of continued life and prosperity, and others reprobate and guilty, deserving death or chastisement of some kind. The decrees recorded in the divine ledger on the first of Tishri, however, are not unalterable. Between the first and

the tenth day the sinner is given the opportunity to repent and to obtain forgiveness on the Day of Atonement. If he avails himself of this opportunity, it is well with him; if not, he is doomed. For on this Day of Atonement all decrees are sealed. Hence the wish and prayer of the pious Jew on the New Year's Day, a wish often repeated in the synagogue service of the day, and conveyed as greeting from friend to friend, is for a *kthiva tova*, a good marking in the heavenly ledger, i. e., a decree for life, health and prosperity; while on the Day of Atonement the prayer is for a *hathima tova*, a good sealing, i. e., a favorable final sealing of the decree.

These ideas regarding the 1st and the 10th of Tishri have been in vogue in the syangogue ever since the days of the Mishna, about the close of the second century of our era. The first Mishna of the Tractate Rosh Hashshanah reads: "There are four New Year's Days. The first of Nisan is the New Year's Day respecting the

numbering of the years of a Jewish monarch's reign, and respecting the order of the festivals; the first of Elul is New Year's Day for the tithing of cattle. . . . . . . ; the first of Tishri is New Year's Day of the civil year, also of the regnal years of foreign rulers of the Sabbatical Year, the Year of Jubilee, the planting of trees (the first three years of their *orla*) and the tithing of vegetables; the first of Shevat, according to the School of Shamai, is New Year's Day in regard to the tithing of fruit; but according to the School of Hillel, the 15th of Shevat. Thus we find the 1st of Tishri fixed as the beginning of the civil year.

In the second Mishna of the same tractate we read: "The world is judged at four different seasons of the year, namely, on Passover in regard to crops; on Pentecost in regard to the fruit of the trees; *on New Year's Day all human beings pass before Him (God) like the sheep of the fold*, for it is said in the Scriptures, He who forms their hearts together, and takes

notice of all their actions (Ps. 33); and on the Feast of Tabernacles judgment is passed regarding rain." We thus find the New Year's Day *par excellence*, that is, the first of Tishri, considered as the Day of Judgment for all human beings. As supplementary to that we read in the Tosephta that both Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda say that the decree is sealed on the Day of Atonement.

Turning now from the rabbinic law and theology, as it is first expressed in the Mishna, or Tosephta, to the Bible, we find that while the tenth of Tishri, the Day of Atonement is indeed, as its very name indicates, a day of grave aspect and meaning, a day of heavenly wiping out of accounts, as it were, the first of Tishri is nowhere spoken of as a New Year's Day, let alone as a Day of Judgment. To be sure, the day is already in the Bible known as a festival, but its distinguishing characteristic is not its being the beginning of the year, but its being the Day of the Sounding of the Shofar. In the two passages of the

Law dealing with this festival we are expressly told that it is to be observed on the 1st of the *seventh month*. It is surely not considered a New Year's Day there. And it is needless to repeat that of an annual Day of Divine Judgment, such day being the first of Tishri, there is no mention in the Bible. The problem therefore presents itself: How came the day to assume its peculiar character in rabbinic times? How shall we bridge over this apparent gulf between the Bible and the Mishna with respect to the significance of the 1st of Tishri? Can we, after all, find in the Bible itself the necessary elements out of which the rabbinnic mind elaborated this awful significance of the day, thus showing the continuity of thought between Bible and Mishna; or must we always assume, as is now becoming quite the mode, certain foreign influences at work that gave new ideas, or lent new color to the old ideas, of the old expounders of Israel's religion? The task that the writer of this essay has set before himself is

to find the solution of the problem in the former alternative.

THE FIRST OF TISHRI AS A NEW YEAR'S DAY.

As mentioned above, the day of this festival, in the two Pentateuchal passages treating of it, is called the first day of the *seventh month*. In Biblical legislation, therefore, Tishri is known as the seventh month, thus making Nisan the first, as it is, indeed, designated whenever the Pesah festival is spoken of. Moreover, in Ex. 12 we have the express Mosaic command: "This month (of the Exodus from Egypt) is for you the head of months, it is for you the *first* of the months of the year." Yet here and there in the Bible an expression or reference occurs showing that the beginning of the Jewish year was also in the autumn. Thus in Ex. 23 we read, "And the Feast of Ingathering (shalt thou observe) at the *outgoing of the year*, when thou hast gathered in the product of thy labors from the field." Similarly in Ex. 34, "And

the Feast of Ingathering at the *turning of the year*." Thus, while no *definite day* in the autumn is spoken of as New Year's Day, the season itself is called the outgoing or turning of the year. Furthermore, in Lev. 25 we read, "And thou shalt go about with a sounding Shofar on the 10th day of the 7th month, on the Day of Atonement shall ye go about with the Shofar in all your land; and ye shall hallow the 50th year . . . . (the Year of Jubilee)." Accordingly the Year of Jubilee at least began in the autumn, in the month of Tishri. May we not assume, then, that all other years, too, began about the time of the autumnal equinox? How, then, reconcile these apparently conflicting calendar systems of the Bible?

For the Higher Critics of the Bible this task is quite easy. Distinguishing in the Pentateuchal legislation earlier and later codes, or collections of laws, such as the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 20–23) of the early regal period, the laws of Deuteronomy of the age of Josiah, and the Priestly

Code, the bulk of the laws of Leviticus and Numbers, of the post-Exilic period, their theory regarding the Biblical calendar is as follows: In very early times, as we may see from the very earliest collection of laws (Ex. 23 and 24), the Jewish year began in the autumn, as the expression *btseth hash-shana* indicates. But when the Israelites returned from the Babylonian captivity, a new terminology for the months, namely, their designation by the ordinal numbers, the first, the second month, etc., was introduced, and later even the Babylonian names, Nisan, Iyar, etc., were used; and the beginning of the year was transferred to Nisan, in harmony with the Babylonian calendar. This explains why, in all the so-called post-Exilic legislation found in Ex., Lev. and Num., and in other writings of post-Exilic date, Nisan is always spoken of as the first month. Yet the older custom of celebrating the new year in the autumn was still retained during the Exilic and post-Exilic periods; but it was retained

only as an ecclesiastical New Year's festival alongside of the official and civil New Year's Day in the spring. And although in Lev. and Num. this so-called ecclestiastical New Year's Day is called only a Day of Sounding the Horn, or a Memorial of Sounding the Horn, the law regarding the Jubilee Year (Lev. 25), however, shows that the trumpet-blowing must be taken as a characteristic feature of the New Year's Day.

Later on, however, so we are told by scholars who adopt this view of the Law, after the Hellenization of Syria and Palestine, a change was again made in the Jewish calendar to harmonize it with the Seleucidan calender that marked the beginning of the year in autumn. Hence, in rabbinic times the first of Tishri is spoken of as the New Year's Day *par excellence*. According to this view the adoption of Nisan as the beginning of the year may be considered, in the words of Professor Karl Marti, (Encyclopedia Biblica) only "an epi-

sode from the sixth to the first century B. C."

We are thus once more shown the influence of foreign thought, method, and manner upon the Jewish mind. It was Babylonian influence that made the Jews change from Tishri to Nisan, and Hellenic example that made them change back from Nisan to Tishri.

A quite different view of the matter is given us by our historian Josephus, who, though not well posted on the Higher Criticism of the Bible, may yet be taken as some authority on Jewish antiquities. "Moses appointed Nisan," says he (Ant. II 3,) "which is Xanthicus, as the first month of their festivals, having led forth the Jews from Egypt in this month. He also made the year to begin from it as regards all the solemnites of divine worship, though as to buying and selling and all other affairs, he preserved the ancient order of beginning the year with Tishri."

On the basis of this statement of Josephus we may therefore say that

from the earliest time, say, the Mosaic period, there were two calendar systems in vogue in Israel, one in which the year began in the autumn, and the other commencing the year with the vernal Equinox: in accordance with the Talmudic dictum; *Nisan rishon l'hodshe hash–shana w'tishri hu reshith hash-shana.* "So much is certain," says Israel Arbahams in the Dictionary of the Bible, "that in the historical time the Hebrew year was solar, though the months were lunar. The calendar must have been roughly congruous with the cycle of natural life. The old Arabs had a Sun year of three hundred and sixty-five days, before Mohammad converted it into the pure lunar year of 354 days, which still prevails." M. Friedman, in his essay on "The New Year and its Liturgy" (The Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. 1, p. 62) proves by the use in the Bible of the two words meaning year, *shana and yamim*, that the Pentateuch is acquainted with two systems of reckoning time, the solar and the lunar. The first term,

says he, from a root meaning to change, denotes the solar year produced by the changes of the seasons, while the second term has reference only to the lunar year. (cf. Gen. I, 14 and XXIV, 55).

It is quite natural that all nations of antiquity as soon as they entered the agricultural stage of existence, or even while yet leading a purely pastoral life, should have been aware of the double measurement of time by the sun and the moon respectively, and should therefore have adopted in a rudimentary way the double cycle of the solar and lunar years. The solar year may have been the first to force itself upon man's consciousness, for it is determined by the course of the seasons, which is a phenomenon within the range of man's most primitive observations. No astronomical calculations are necessary to approximately define the solar year; for the recurrence of summer and winter, spring and autumn, sufficiently determine its course. And this primitive calendar is quite adequate for all

economic purposes. It lacks exactness, however. It has no definite beginning, that is for the primitive mind not equipped with any astronomical knowledge besides its crude observations. Here the periodical changes of the moon come to man's assistance. There is a definite marking of time by the periodical reappearance of the moon. Nay, the very division of the year into months must have been suggested by the periodic appearance of the moon, instead of being the result of astronomical calculations based on the solar year. Just as in the Anglo-Saxon languages the word "month" is derived from "moon," so in Hebrew *hodesh and yerah* also stand for moon and new moon, respectively.

When, therefore, certain **fixed** days are necessary, as for instance, for purposes of worship and celebration, the lunar cycle is made use of. The discrepancy that is soon noticed between the two cycles, the cycle of the seasons, and the cycle of the moons, and the different methods adopted for their synchronization, that is, the

different schemes of intercalation, form another subject. In this connection it is only necessary to note that all nations of antiquity knew, and, in their primitive calendar must have made use of, the solar as well as the lunar year. It is, therefore, not necessary to say with Prof. Sayce, when speaking of the institution of the Passover (E. H. H., p. 178), that a change was made in the calendar. "The Hebrew year had begun in the autumn in the month of September; but side by side with this West-Semitic calendar there had also been in use another calendar, that of Babylonia, according to which the year began in Nisan or March. It was this Babylonian calendar which was now introduced for ritual purposes. While the civil year still began in the autumn, it was ordained that the sacred year should begin in the spring. . . . . The beginning of the year was henceforth fixed by the Passover moon." (Ibid.)

With Prof. Sayce, too, therefore, it is all due to Babylonian influence; only he traces that influence to a re-

moter period, that of the Exodus. To all those who strenuously contend for Babylonian influence upon Israel's regulation of his calendar the question may be put: Why was not *the first of Nisan*, then, made the Jewish New Years Day, and from the time of the adoption of the Babylonian calendar celebrated in such wise as, say, the first of Tishri, has been ever since rabbinic times? Among the Babylonians the first of Nisan the day of Zagmuku, that is, New Year's Day, was probably the most sacred day of the year. (*vide* Jastrow R. B. A., p. 677 ff). Why was the first of Nisan at no time celebrated as such among the Hebrews? Let us then leave the Babylonian and all other influences out of the account, and resume the argument as it was started above.

The ancient Hebrews knew of both the solar and lunar years, and as among the ancients a calendar is primarily of necessity for purposes of worship and other sacred celebrations, we find the Torah simultaneously using the double calendar. The principal

festivals of the Jewish year were from earliest times the three season-festivals: the spring-festival, Pesah, or Month of Abib; the harvest festival; and the Feast of the Ingathering of Fruit. This last festival is spoken of as occurring *b'tseth hash-shana*, at the outgoing of the year. When all the labors in the field and garden were finished, the cycle of the solar year was approximately complete. But a growing religious consciousness cannot rest satisfied with a rather vague determination of the most sacred seasons of the year. Definite dates are wanted, and these can be secured only by following the lunar cycle. Hence, in the more detailed prescriptions of the sacred celebrations in the Torah, such as in Lev. and Num., the lunar months and dates are given. The months are designated by ordinal numbers, the 1st, the 2nd, the 3rd month; and the spring-month, Nisan, is made the starting point, and called the first, not because it was such in the Babylonian calendar, but because, as the Law repeatedly tells us, it is

the *month of the Exodus*, the pivotal event in Israel's history and religion. The twelfth chapter of Exodus, therefore, represents for us a genuine ancient, i. e., Mosaic tradition. If Nisan became the beginning of the year in imitation of the Babylonian calendar, why were not the Babylonian names of the months used at once instead of designating the months by ordinal numbers? In the post-Exilic writings of the Bible the Babylonian names Nisan, Iyar, etc., are used, showing that the names of the months, indeed, were taken from Babylon, as the Talmud remarks, * but not necessarily the calendar. Everywhere else in the Bible we find the time marked according to the lunar cycle (which must have been done as soon as the art of writing was made use of) and the months numbered, with Nisan as the first. The only reason why the Higher

---

*"The names of the months were brought along with us from Babylonia."—(Jerusalem Talmud, Rosh Hashshana I. 1.)

Critics refuse to recognize the Hebrew year as beginning with Nisan even in early times is that all Peutateuchal passages in which the months are so designated are declared by them post-Exilic.

But aside from the fact that this theory of the Higher Critics regarding the so-called priestly legislation of the Pentateuch, is yet far from having received the endorsement of all eminent Bible students, yea, that a very respectable band of scholars, headed by the Assyriologists Sayce and Hommel, find in the monuments a confirmation of the traditional view of the Mosaic origin of the laws of the Pentateuch; there are yet such passages as 1. K. 8:2, giving the date of the dedication of Solomon's Temple, and 1 K. 12:32, giving the date of the autumn-festival instituted by Jeroboam. Shall we say that such dating by the lunar cycle stamps these passages, too, as post-Exilic additions, even if there are no other grounds for considering them as such? Nay, there is no definite dating anywhere in the

O. T. that is not according to the lunar year, with Nisan as its first month.

While in their economic affairs the end of the summer season was looked upon as the end of the year, in their calendrical dating and calculation the Israelites never considered Tishri, which is generally at the beginning of autumn, as the first month of the year. As stated above, the Higher Critics' opinion is that when, during the Babylonian captivity, the Babylonian calendar was adopted, and Nisan superseded Tishri as the beginning of the year, the latter month was still retained as the beginning of the ecclesiastical year, and that traces of this usage are still found in the Bible. For example, in Ezek., 40, we read: "In the five-and-twentieth year of our exile, in the *beginning of the year*, on the tenth day of the month . . . ." The Hebrew phrase for "the beginning of the year" is here Rosh hash-shana." The month here meant, we are told, is Tishri; and yet the tenth of this month is called by Ezek.

"the beginning of the year." When we ask how it is that the "10th" day of the month should be spoken of as the beginning of the year, we are reminded that each Jubilee year, according to the law in Leviticus, was also inaugurated on the "tenth day" of the seventh month. This is all the proof brought forward in support of the contention that the month not specified by Ezek. is Tishri, and that the tenth of this month was for the Exilic prophet the beginning of the year; and this contention is made in the face of the fact that everywhere else with Ezek. the year begins in Nisan, and the months are numbered accordingly, as the following passage conclusively shows: "In the first month, on the 14th day of the month, ye shall have the Passover . . . . In the 7th month, on the 15th day of the month, on the Hag (Succoth festival) he shall do likewise for seven days. . . . ." Shall we say that according to Ezekiel the Passover is to be observed in Tishri, and the citron

and palm branches are to be brought in Nisan?

Nor does the Jubilee law in Leviticus prove anything in favor of this contention. The Jubilee year, from its very character, could begin only in autumn, after all the labors in the field were over; and on the 10th of Tishri, the Day of Atonement, the most sacred day of the month, the year was proclaimed and inaugurated, which again proves that at that time Tishri was not considered the first month of the Ecclesiastical year, or any other kind of year, for otherwise its first day would have been the New Year's Day, the most proper occasion for a solemn proclamation of the Jubilee year.

Another proof of the sole existence of the old Tishri year is ingeniously found by some in the account of the Flood, Gen. VII-VIII. The "post-Exilic" author of the flood story is supposed to have knowledge of the old calendar system of Israel, which consisted of a solar year beginning with Tishri, and this solar year he tries to harmonize

with the Babylonian lunar year in vogue in his own day. In Gen. 7:11 we read: "In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the 2nd month, on the seventeenth day of the month, all the fountains of the great deep were burst and the windows of the heavens were opened." The second month here spoken of, it is argued, must be Hesvan, for that is the season of heavy rains in Palestine. Hence the first month is Tishri. Then, in Gen. 8:14 we read, "In the 2nd month of the subsequent year, on the 27th day of the month, the earth became dry." Accordingly the flood lasted twelve months and ten days, hese additional ten days being the author's device for equalizing the 12 lunar months with the solar year, for the general Semitic tradition seems to have been that the flood lasted one year.

Now, to begin with, the 2nd month spoken of by the author need not be Hesvan, the month of heavy rains, for since we read that all the fountains of the great deep were burst,

and the windows of the heaven were opened, the flood did not depend upon the copious rains in their natural season. No fountains of the great deep are burst then. Secondly, even if the additional ten days represent the authors' attempt to equalize the solar with the lunar year, it only shows the authors' astronomical knowledge, but by no means that his view of the old Israelitish year was that it began with Tishri. As a matter of fact, it is just as futile to look for a reason why his flood period terminates on the 27th as it is to ask why it begins on the 17th. According to the Chaldean account of the flood, as found in the cuneiform inscriptions, the flood is over in three times seven days. (Schrader, CIOT.)

And still another proof of the old Tishri year is sought in the numbering of the regnal years of certain kings. "The Passover" says Prof. Marti (Encyc. Bibl.), "could not have been observed in accordance with the precept of the newly found Law unless the new year was in

autumn, in the 18th year of Josiah (cf. 2 K. 23:23; and 22:3), and that on no other assumption can the 4th year of Jehoiakim be made to synchronize with the first year of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. 25:1) and with the year of the battle of Charchemish (Jer. 46:2). As a matter of fact, these two instances prove nothing. Why could not Josiah's regnal year indeed have begun in Nisan? Is it absolutely necessary to suppose that all his reforms carried out by him according to the precepts of the newly found book (1 K. 23) took place before the observance of the Passover? Must he not rather have applied himself to that which was nearest at hand, and, the discovery of the book occuring about the Passover season, have begun with the proclamation of the Passover, following that up with other reforms? As to the synchronization of the fourth year of Jehoiakim with the first year of Nebuchadnezzar and the battle of Charchemish, as long as authorities are not yet quite agreed on the dates of Babylonian history,

one giving the year of the battle of Charchemish as 606 B. C, and of Nebuchadnezzar's accession to the throne as 604, another, the battle of Charchemish 605-604, and still another 605 as the date of both, there is no more difficulty about the Biblical numbers if Jehoiakim's regnal year began in Nisan than if it began in Tishri.

On the other hand, some other dates in the historic and prophetic books of the Bible unmistakably show that the regnal year of the king began in Nisan (cf. 2 K. 25:1-8; Jer. 28:1-17). Such, too, is the tradition preserved in the Talmud (Babylonian Talmud Rosh Hashana, 3).

A. Eppstein, too, in his "Mikkadmoniyyoth Hayyehudim" ("Antiquities of the Jews"), though admitting that from Scriptures it appears that they had two calendars, one beginning in Nisan, and the other in Tishri, claims that the Tishri year was the older, being in vogue before the giving of the Law. According to him both Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kip-

pur represent the New Year's Days of this old calendar, while the three *haggim* or pilgrimage festivals" are of later origin, introduced by the law-giver. But how could there be two New Year's Days in quick succession every year? He answers thus: "The Israelites, like all nations of antiquity, before the Law, fixed the year by the course of the moon, obtaining 354 days, and began the year with Tishri, the 1st of it being the New Year's Day. Then when they became acquainted with the solar year, and made it of 364 days so as to obtain 52 full weeks, in order to equalize the two, they added ten days to each lunar year, and began the new solar year with Yom Kippur, the tenth of Tishri. Counting again from Yom Kippur 354 days, they obtained another lunar New Year's Day, and ten days later a solar. Our ten days of penitence were before the giving of the Law, the days between one New Year's Day and another.

This theory, though attractive on the face of it, contains so many ab-

surdities that a little closer examination would have revealed to its author its ridiculousness. How can we say that the oldest year is the lunar? What was there to give the ancients the very conception of *year* if not the circle of the seasons which constitute the solar year? If the year was at first lunar, why should it have begun with Tishri? Does that not show that the year was solar? Tishri bringing with it the conclusion of the labors in the field? If ten days were added to equalize the two years, then Yom Kippur, the solar New Year's Day, should have been on the 11th of Tishri. If the new counting of 354 days began with Yom Kippur, then the following lunar New Year's Day would be ten days later, past the first quarter of the moon, a pretty new moon, and the following, past the full moon, and so on.

But the worst of it is that of all these New Year's Days, whether one or two annually, not one trace is found in the Bible except the indirect ones these scholars find. Every

other old usage the law-giver retains, even the *Azazel*, except the most interesting of all—the New Year's Days themselves.

In a footnote Mr. Eppstein says that in fact none of the ancient nations had a special designation for their first day of the year except the Persians, who called it "Neu Ruz," which means the New Day. (Is not this the meaning of the Hebrew "*hodesh*"?) From them, then, the Jews learned to call theirs "Rosh Hashanah". Why is there no indication of it in post-Babylonian Biblical literature?

And so, once more, all definite dating and calendar calculation in ancient Israel in pre-Exilic as well as post-Exilic times has the Nisan year as its basis. We find it so as late as the first century B. C., in the first Book of Maccabees, where the evidence in its favor is most conclusive, as has been well demonstrated by Schurer (The Jewish People in the Time of J. C., First Division, I, pp. 36-44); and for the first century A. D. we have

the explicit statement of Josephus.

From all this there follows that in ancient Israel **there was no New Year's Day.** Nisan was the first month of the year, but the first of Nisan was not celebrated. The autumn season was in all economic affairs, in the fields and the marts, considered as the out-going of the (solar) year. The three festivals of the month of Tishri helped to imprint this character of finality on it. But Tishri was at no time in the early history considered the first month. And the first of Tishri was no New Year's Day.

Yet is was a sacred day, though of a different character. It was the "Day of the Blowing of the Horn" or the "Memorial of the Blowing of the Horn". As is well known, the first of every month, *rosh hodesh*, was celebrated. Tishri being the 7th month, its first day received additional significance, for the number 7 was the determinant of all sacred seasons: the seventh day—Sabbath; seven weeks after Passover—the harvest festival; the seventh

year—the Sabbatical Year; and after seven Sabbatical years—the year of Jubilee. That, however, would have made the first of Tishri a particularly sacred new moon, celebrated by additional sacrifices, and no more. That it became a Memorial of the Blowing of the Horn was due to another circumstance, namely, the propinquity of the Day of Atonement on the tenth of the month.

The expression a *Memorial of the Blowing of the Horn* has puzzled the commentators. Even Mr. Arnold B. Ehrlich, who in his commentary "Mikra Ke-Pshuto" has illuminated many obscurities in the Bible which the Higher and Lower Critics combined have not been able to penetrate, despairingly exclaims anent this expression: "It cannot be learned from its context, and I cannot explain what it means". There is, however, another passage in the Bible that readily explains this phrase. In ordering the making of two silver trumpets, and in specifying the occasions on which they shall be used, the law-giver says: "And if

you go to war in your land against the oppressor that oppresseth you, then shall you blow an alarm with the trumpets, and you shall be remembered (wnizkartem) before the Lord your God and you shall be saved from your enemies''. (Num. 10:9.)

The blowing of the trumpet, then, when not meant as a signal, as, for example, for the starting or the halting of the host, or as a proclamation, as in the ushering in of the Jubilee Year, was for the purpose of being remembered before God and being helped by Him. Such is the meaning of the ''Memorial of the Blowing of the Trumpet''. On the first of Tishri, the tenth day of which month was the sacred Day of Atonement, on which the High Priest was ''to make an Atonement for you to cleanse you, so that from all your sins before the Lord you be pure'' (Lev. 16:30), a preparatory celebration was to take place, in order to be remembered before God. This, then, was the origin of the Day of Memorial, which in turn formed the nucleus around which

other elements gathered to form a Day of Judgment, which then became the New Year's Day.

There can be no doubt that the day assumed its character as a Day of Judgment before it became a New Year's Day that the idea of Judgment Day was a contributory element to the making of the New Year's Day.

That such was the idea of many of the early Jewish theologians and exegetes may be seen from their interpretation of the Biblical phrase *zikhron truah*. The *truah*, according to them, is the same as that which was used at the coronation or anointing of kings (cf. I Sam. X, 24; I K I, 34, etc). Hence, on this day, say they, we are to be "reminded" of the creation when God became king over his creatures. Such is the interpretation given by Abarbanel, Ibn Ezra, Aboab in his Menorath ham-Maor, Bahya ben Asher, in his Kad hak-Kemah; and such, in effect, is the explanation of later Jewish scholars, such as Reggio in Hat-Torah w'ha-philosophia, and Isaac Baer Lewinsohn in his Beth

Yehuda. Of course, such interpretation of "zikhron truah" is, to say the least, far-fetched. The idea of the first of Tishri being the anniversary of the creation is itself of rabbinic origin. But we see that early Jewish exegetes felt that there was a closer and earlier connection between "zikhron truah" and "yom haddin" than between the former and a New Year's Day, for kingship and judgeship are kindred ideas, or rather, the former implies the latter.

In his essay on "The New Year's Day and its Liturgy," mentioned above, M. Friedman assumes the priority of the first of Tishri as a New Year's Day. According to him the importance which the first of the seventh month gained was due to historical reasons, beginning in the time of Solomon, when the dedication of the Temple took place in that month, and culminating under Ezra. "That month was selected for the commencement of the year," says he, "because the settlement of the colonists began therein. . . . . . And

so the Mosaic Feast of Trumpets was transformed into a New Year's Feast." (Jewish Quarterly, Rev., Vol. I, p. 67.) But where is the evidence of it? If it was then already the beginning of the year, why is it everywhere in post-Babylonian literature spoken of as the seventh month, yea, even as late as the time of the Book of the Maccabees? And why has Josephus no knowledge of it? The first of Tishri as a New Year's Day is, therefore, of later origin, later even than its evolution as a Day of Judgment. But whence came this latter idea to be incorporated into the day?

The modern *savants* who have so far tried to explain the Day of Judgment have once more called in the ever ready and convenient *Babylonian influence* to their aid. The month of Tishri was dedicated by the Babylonians to their sun-god, and already Halevy in his "Melanges de Critique et d'histoire" (quoted by J. Abrahams in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible) conjectures that this originated the later Jewish association of Tishri

with the creation and the Day of Judgment. Dr. K. Kohler, who at a recent Babbinical Conference made a gallant charge upon Delitzsch's Babel-Bible lectures, strangely enough falls under the Babel-Bible spell in his article on Atonement in the Jewish Encycl.: "Down to the first century, in Apocalyptical as well as in New Testament writings." says Dr. Kohler, "the idea of the divine judgment was mainly eschatalogical in character, as deciding the destiny of the soul after death rather than on earth. But under the influence of Babylonian mythology, which spoke of the beginning of the year, 'Zag-muk', on the 1st day of Nisan as the time when the gods decided the destiny of life (Jensen, Kosmologie, pp. 84–86, 238), the idea developed also in Jewish circles that on the first of Tishri, the sacred New Year's Day and the anniversary of the creation, man's doings were judged, and his destiny was decided; and that on the 10th of Tishri the decree of heaven was sealed,—a view still unknown to Philo." Prof. Morris Jas-

trow, Jr., does not go quite the length of Dr. Kohler, though he, too, admits Babylonian influence. "The 'Zagmuku' New Year's Day, that is the first of Nisan festival, in its developed form, has striking points of resemblance to the Jewish New Year's Day. The Jewish New Year is known as Rosh Hashanah, which is an exact equivalent of the Babylonian Resh shatti (or Zagmuku). A difference, however, between the Babylonian and the Jewish festival is that the latter is celebrated in the 7th month. It is not correct, therefore, to assume that the Hebrews borrowed their Rosh Hashanah from the Babylonians. Even after they adopted the Babylonian calendar they continued to regard the 7th month, the harvest month, as the beginning of the year. That among the Babylonians the 7th month also had a sacred character may be concluded from the meaning of the ideagraphs with which the name is written. . . . . . At all events we must for the present assume that the He-

brews developed their New Year's Day which they may have originally received from Babylonia, independently of Marduk's festival, though since the Rosh Hashanah does not come into prominence among the Jews until the period of the so-called Babylonian exile, the possibility of a direct Babylonian influence in the later conceptions connected with the day cannot be denied."

And in a foot-note Prof. Jastrow adds: "The opinion of many scholars that the Rosh Hashanah dates from the Babylonian exile, because not referred to in the Book of Deuteronomy, is open to serious objections. The festival has traces of antiquity like the day of Atonement, and appears to have been revived during the captivity under Babylonian influence." (Jastrow R. B. A., p. 681.)

If it was under the influence of Babylonian mythology that the later Jews elaborated their Day of Judgment, why did not the first of Nisan, which was the first month of the Jewish calendar as well as the Babylonian,

become such a day? And why do we not find the Day of Judgment right after their return from the Babylonian captivity, just as we find the Babyonian names of the months? No, we must here again part company with the doughty Babel-Bible champions; for the 1st of Tishri as a Day of Judgment is a purely Jewish development, the product of Jewish theological thinking.

Before proceeding with the argument, reference must be made to the very ingenious theory regarding the origin of the Day of Judgment advanced by M. Friedman in his essay in the Jewish Quarterly Review. After speaking of the great Messianic expectations, especially those voiced by the Babylonian and post-Babylonian prophets and Psalmists, expectations concerning the recognition by all nations of Yahwe as their God, he focuses the readers' attention on the Messianic prophecy of Zech. XIV, which culminates in the announcement of the universal celebration of the Feast of Succoth. He then speaks

of it as the "Messianic Feast of Succoth" with which "the first and tenth of Tishri had to be harmonized." The first of Tishri already being the New Year (which, however, it was not), "we can clearly see how the Day of the Sounding of the Trumpet suddenly came to be significant of universal salvation. The shofar of Rosh hash-Shana was regarded as foreshadowing the great trumpet of the future, which will proclaim universal salvation, and the end of Satan, of death, and of all human ills. The sound of the Sinaitic shofar, by which the Lord announced himself as Israel's God, will pass into the tones of the Messianic shofar. Then will the Lord be King of the whole earth. . . . . . These thoughts form the subject-matter of the liturgy for the day. . . . . .

"With these Messianic notions of the Kingdom of Heaven and the sovereignity of God was coupled the picture of the "yom haddin," the Day of Judgment, the so-called last judgment which will precede the universal

redemption, when God will summon all before His tribunal."

For this idea of the original Messianic meaning of the "yom haddin" he finds support even in the Scriptural readings assigned for the day. Gen. XXI and I Sam. I. Why were those chapters containing the narratives of the births of Isaac and Samuel selected? His answer is: *eim*,-mother is often used in Biblical language for city, just as *banoth*,–daughter for the suburbs or country-towns surrounding the city. Jerusalem is often compared to a mother bereft of her children. Hence, Sarah and Hannah, the childless, remembered by God with sons, foreshadow the future of Jerusalem, the desolate, who will yet be remembered and blessed with the return of her children. "This was expressed in the fact that Sarah and Hannah became the patronesses of the day."

"Then," continues Friedman, "a dispute arose in the rabbinic schools as to whether the world was created in Tishri or in Nisan, which means

whether the first creation had the aspect of nature in the autumn, when all vegetation is full-grown and ripe, or in the spring, when things are found in germ and bud only. The former opinion prevailed. The New Year now had a meaning; for it was thus reckoned from the creation of the world. And now the final step was taken in the development of the day. The first of Tishri, according to the Mishna, is "New Year's Day of the civil year, the Sabbatic year, the Jubilee and the planting of trees", and "on the results of the agricultural year hung the fate of individuals and nations. . . . . . Take in conjunction with these natural circumstances the current belief that the creation of man began at this time, and the following *halakha* need cause no surprise: "On New Year's Day, all beings pass before Him like the sheep of the fold." The conception of the "yom haddin", the Last Judgment, which accompanied the Messianic idea, was anticipated and transferred to the New Year. On this

day, it was believed, all men are annually judged.

"This conception of Rosh hashshana did not, however, at first gain universal recognition (cf. Bab. T. R. H., 16 a. b.) nor did it receive immediate expression in the liturgy. The day continued to be a "yom zikkaron", and was nowhere designated as the "yom haddin". The term Yom haddin was understood to apply to the Last Judgment of the Messianic age. This is clear from R. H. 16b. Rashi's before note is: To the Day of Judgment, when the dead shall live. . . . . . It was at a later period that the New Year was through Rav's influence in Babylon recognized in the liturgy as the first day of creation, and the decisive Day of Judgment. . . . . . The portion "ze hayyom t'hillath maasekha" to "khayyom hazze" was interpolated, and is known in the original authorities under the name of "tkiatha d'rav."

Yom haddin, then, as first applied to the first of Tishri, meant the Last Judgment, which was to precede the

universal Messianic redemption, and that was due to its proximity to Succoth, which, according to Zechariah, will be the universal festival of the Messianic era. But what warrant have we for making Succoth a Messianic festival merely because Zech. speaks of it in connection with the Messianic era? That in the early post-Babylonian period Succoth was the most important festival is sufficiently attested by the narratives of Ezra-Nehemiah. Hence, the emphasis that Zech. puts on it. From the words of Zech., "that whoso will not come up out of the families of the earth unto Jerusalem to bow down before the king, the Lord of hosts—even upon these there shall be no ruin," it would seem that the festival had some connection with the blessing of rain, an idea reproduced in the Mishna *ouwhag niddonin al ham-mayim* Any other significance cannot be attached to Zechariah's mention of Succoth.

That *Yom haddin* is also used in rabbinnic literature for the Last Judgment preceding the general resur-

rection, as is done in R. H. 16b, is true. But nowhere is it so used with reference to any definite date, the first of Tishri or any other. Moreover, this theory of the original Messianic significance of Rosh-hash-Shana as the Last Judgment Day takes no account of the close relation between Rosh-hash-Shana and Yom hak-kippurim, a relation that clearly exists in the Pentateuch, and which has continued to the latest times, so that the two are together spoken of as the *yamim noraim*. It is principally in this relation that we shall find all further steps of development involved. It is true that in the liturgy of the day the Messianic element is very prominent. But this is due to the rabbinic interpretation of *zikhron truah*, which was cited above, and which must be a very old one. "To sound the horn" meant for them also to proclaim God King, and God's universal Kingship will be fully established only in the Messianic era. But out of such elements the rabbinic idea *berosh hashshana kol*

be olam ovrin lephonov, etc., could never have developed.

As to the reason for the Scripture portions assigned for the day, there are in the narrative of Sarah the expressions *wadonay pakad*, which is the equivalent of *zakhar*, and *lamoed asher dibber*, and in the narrative of Hannah, *wayizkreha adonay*, and *wayhi lithkuphoth hayyamim*. It is probably these expressions that led the teachers of the early synagog to connect these events with Rosh hashshana and to say: *berosh, hashshana niphkdah Sarah Rahel w Hanah*, in which both Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Joshua agree. Moreover, the prophetic portion is always selected on account of the similarity of its import to that of the Pentateuchal lesson. Furthermore, such expressions as, "For a God of knowledge is the Lord, and by Him are actions weighed. . . The Lord killeth and maketh alive. . . The Lord maketh poor and maketh rich. . . . . .," contained in Hannah's prayer, furnished an additional reason for its selection.

Thus we find no solid basis for the theory of the transition of the first of Tishri from the *zikhron teruah* of the Bible to the rabbinic *yom haddin* by way of the "Messianic feast of Succoth." The *zikhron teruah*, as a prepation for the *yom hakkippurim*, alone furnishes us the germ for all subsequent development.

Divine Judgment, Rewards and Punishments.

"God judges man's actions and rewards and punishes in this life"—this idea runs like a silver thread throughout the Old Testament. It is, to use a Talmudic formula, "written in the Law, repeated in the prophets, and reiterated in the Hagiographa". Remove all the passages that directly express, or, in one way or another illustrate this doctrine, and, it is no exaggeration to say, you have less than one-half of the Old Testament left. Beginning with the Book of Genesis, we have the story of the garden of Eden, the fratricide, the

flood, the Tower of Babel, Sodom and Gamorrah, various episodes in the lives of the patriarchs, etc., etc., throughout the Bible. Abraham's plea to God in behalf of Sodom and Gamorrah is: "Shall not the *Judge of the whole earth do judgment?*" (Gen. 18:25.) In Solomon's dedicatory prayer we read the words: "And thou wilt hear in the heaven and do and *judge thy servants as to declare the wicked guilty and bring his conduct upon his head and to declare the righteous just to give him according to his righteousness.*" (I K., 8:32.)

It is entirely unnecessary to dilate on this point. Now, since God takes note of our actions, and judges us, and since many of our wrong-doings may be altogether hidden from us, for which, therefore, no restitution and no sacrifice can be made, a thought to which the Psalmist already gives expression: "Who can guard against errors? from secret faults do thou cleanse me" (Psalm 19:13.), the annual Day of Atonement was appointed for a general cancellation and

clearance of accounts. The choice of that particular day, the tenth of Tishri, was made for good reasons. It was the season when, after the harvest and ingathering of fruit, all human affairs, all accounts arising from their economic relations, were settled and cleared. It was the season of rejoicing. And, according to their mode of thinking, it was fitting that such a season should be preceded by a day of abstinence and penitence as a preparation. According to Herodutus the Egyptians fasted on the day preceding their Isis festival.

When this idea of an annual atonement had sufficiently impressed itself on the minds of the people, and when the preparatory celebration on the first of Tishri, the day on which they were to be remembered before God in order to be granted conciliation, had become a fixed institution, a question must have often suggested itself to the devout minds of the scribes and rabbis: "Does God really occupy himself on those days with the work of remembering or recording (zikkaron)

the merits of his children, and of clearing their accounts by "*covering up their sins*" or "*accepting a ransom for them*," whichever the word *kapper* originally may have meant?" For, after all, the Day of Memorial and the Day of Atonement, as ordained by the Mosaic law, are only the expression of a pious wish, *to make atonement;* the ceremonial and sacrificial ritual prescribed are only a means by which it was expected to obtain the end. But where was the assurance that all this corresponded to the procedure of the Divine Power above; that it was God's season, too, of remembering and pardoning? This assurance was found in certain Scriptural passages that were, it is true, orginally not intended to convey any such idea.

The student of rabbinic literature knows that many other ideas and doctrines nowhere found, or found in germ only, or only broadly hinted at in Biblical Judaism, were by the rabbis elaborated in great detail merely by an ingenious interpretation and skillful combination of Biblical texts, by

drawing sometimes warranted, sometimes unwarranted conclusions from them. The idea of the Messianic age, for example, of the glories of the future of Israel and the world (*olam habba*, is certainly of Jewish origin. No one has so far disputed that, or claimed for it any foreign influence. We can trace its development without interruption from the very first of the literary prophets to the latest teachers of the Gemara. Yet the elaboration of the picture of the future world, *olam habba*, the filling in of all the details as to the how, when and where, as to the character of the Messiah, the events that are to precede and to follow the Messiah's coming (some of which details being not only matters of individual opinion but doctrines of almost general acceptance, such as the belief that all Israel will have a share in the world to come, that confusion and tribulation, *havle hammashiah*, are to precede, that Elijah is to be the forerunner)—all these details, though nowhere expressly found in the Scriptures, are derived from

Scriptural passages, passages containing a word, a phrase, or an allusion which, according to the laws, or rather license, of Haggadic exposition, were made to yield ten-fold of what they were originally intended to express. It was this peculiar rabbinic exegis that evolved many other new doctrines and ideas. The diligent search of the Scriptures by the rabbis was rewarded by ample finds, and among these finds we may count the discovery that *the season o the blowing of the shofar was also the season of the divine judgment of the world.*

As in other books of the Bible, so in the Psalms great emphasis is laid on the fact of God's judging the world, the nations, and individual men. But a most remarkable coincidence is found in a number of Psalms. In these the Psalmist calls upon the worshiper to praise God with the sound of the shofar or the trumpet, and at the same time expresses his assurance that God judges the world. The Mishna that contains the dictum that "on the first of Tishri all the inhabitants of

the world pass before him like the sheep of the fold" bases this dictum on a verse of Psalm 33, "He who fashioneth their hearts all together, who hath regard to all their works." There is apparently nothing in this verse to give rise to the idea that the 1st of Tishri is the day of divine judgment. Yet, a few other verses of the Psalm will make it clear why this one is quoted. . . . . . . "(3) Sing unto Him a new song, make beautiful music with the shofar-sound. (4) For the word of the Load is upright and His work is done in thruth. (5) He loveth rightousness and judgment, of the kindness of the Lord the earth is full. . . . . . . (13) The Lord looketh from heaven, He seeth all the sons of man. (14) From the place of his habitation he directeth His view upon all the inhabitants of the earth. (15) He fashioneth their hearts all together, He hath regard to all their works." Thus we find in this Psalm the juxtoposition, originally without any special meaning, of the sounding of the shofar and judgment. A still

better example is the Scriptural quotation in the Tosephta in support of the same idea. "Blow on the new moon the shofar, at the time appointed for the day of our feast; for it is a statute for Israel, a judgment (mishpat, here meaning, however, an ordinance) for the God of Jacob" (Ps. 81:4-5). These are the only two passages the rabbis use as a basis of their doctrine. But there are others in the Scriptures that could serve just as well. "God ascendeth amid triumphant shout, the Lord amid the sound of the shofar. . . . . . God reigneth over the nations, God sitteth upon his holy throne" (Ps. 47: 6-9). God's sitting upon the throne is understood as being for the purpose of pronouncing judgment. "Righteousness and judgment are the prop of Thy throne, kindness and truth precede Thy presence. Happy the people that know the shofar's sound, O, Lord, in the light of Thy countenance will they firmly walk" (Ps. 89: 15-16). "With trumpets and the sound of the shofar shout joyfully before the King the

Lord. . . . . . . for He cometh to judge the earth, He will judge the world with righteousness, and people with equity" (Ps. 98:6–9). (Psalm 66 might also be cited.)

Admitting that the simultaneous occurrence of the two ideas in these passages was without any special meaning, or purely accidental, it was yet a felicitous find for the rabbis. A special day of the blowing of the shofar was already one of the long established institutions, and one of our most sacred books, the Psalms, shows us some connection between this institution and divine judgment. Nay, the very language of the Mishna is significant. While for the other days of judgment a prosaic formula is used in harmony with the general style of the Mishna, like this: "The world is judged at four seasons, to-wit: on the Passover, with regard to crops; on Pentecost, with regard to the fruit of trees; and on the Feast of Booths with regard to water," for Rosh Hashanah a formula is used that sounds like a quotation, or a refer-

ence to some familiar lesson: "All the people of the world pass before Him like "bene maron." The Talmud gives various renderings of this "bene maron," the first one being—sheep. This is likely to be the only correct one, and the entire formula may be an allusion to Ezek. 34, where Israel is spoken of as a flock of sheep neglected and maltreated by their shepherds, the rulers. Among other things we read: "For thus hath said the Lord Eternal, behold, I am here, and I will both inquire for my flock and search for them. As a shepherd searcheth for his flock" (this simile is used by Rabbi Amnon in his *Unthanneh tokeph*) "on the day that he is among his flock that are scattered, so will I search for my flocks. . . . . . And as for you, O my flock, thus saith the Lord Eternal, behold, I will judge between lamb and lamb, between the wethers and the he-goats. . . . . . ." (Ezek. 34:11-12, 17). The same simile is used in the New Testament when speaking of the last judgment: "And before Him shall

be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another as a shepard divideth the sheep from the goats. . . . . ." (Mt. 25:32).

The idea of the Day of Judgment on the 1st of Tishri was thus fixed in the minds of the people. It required no foreign influence to give rise to it; it was not an importation from abroad. It was found in Holy Writ. Other ideas of secondary importance soon gathered around it. That God keeps a record in heaven is also an idea found in the Bible. Thus Moses says to God: "Blot me out from thy book" (Ex. 32-32). And in the Psalms we read: "Let the wicked be blotted out from the book of life, and let them not be inscribed with the righteous" (Ps. 69:29). Yea, in this book everything seems to be recorded. "In thy book were all of them written down, the days which have been formed while not yet one of them was here" (Ps. 139:16). In Malachi the book is called "Sefer zikkaron," a book of remembrance.

In it the merits of the God-fearing are recorded. "Then conversed they who fear the Lord one with the other, and the Lord listened and heard it, and there was written a book of remembrance before Him for those who fear the Lord and those who respect His name" (Mal. 3:16). In Daniel's vision God sits down upon His throne "to hold judgment, and the books are opened" (Dan. 7:10). This last idea is combined in the Talmud with the doctrine of divine judgment on the New Year's Day, and we read: "Rabbi Krospedai says in the name of Rabbi Yohanan, three books are open on the New Year's Day; one for the utterly wicked, one for the perfectly righteous, and one for mediocre people. The perfectly righteous are at once inscribed, and their decrees sealed, for life; the utterly wicked are at once inscribed, and their decrees sealed, for death; while the mediocre ones' judgment is suspended until the Day of Atonement. If they show merit, they are inscribed for life; if not, for death."

That the 1st of Tishri was considered a Day of Judgment before it attained the distinction of being the New Year's Day is also shown by the liturgy. The earliest liturgical portions characteristic of the day are *malkiot zikhronoth* and *shophroth.* And the rabbis explain: These are recited in order that God may be proclaimed King, and may remember you for good, your prayer uniting with the shofar blast to remind Him.

Such is the history of the development of the annual Day of Judgment of the Jewish calendar, according to the Mishna. However, Rosh Hashanah is not the only day of judgment, although it was certainly the first to be considered as such, for the formula used for it in the Mishna, namely, "all the inhabitants of the world pass before Him like the sheep of the fold," shows it to have been already long established as such in the popular consciousness. But Passover, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Tabernacles, are also days of judgment on which certain blessings are granted or

denied. A statement in the Tosephta, however, shows us that that was only an afterthought, and the doctrine was formulated as an explanation of the characteristic service and ceremonial of each of these festivals. "Rabbi Akkiba says the Torah ordains that barley-ears be brought on Passover, which is the season of the ripening of the barley crop, in order that the crop be blessed; that wheat and the first fruit be brought on the Feast of Weeks, which is the season of the ripening of fruit, in order that the fruit of the trees be blessed; that water be poured upon the altar on the Feast of Tabernacles, in order that you be blessed with abundant rain; that *malkioth*, *zikhronoth* and *shophroth* (certain Scriptural passages in which God is spoken of as king, as remembering and keeping His promises, and in which the sounding of the shofar is mentioned) be recited, in order that God may be proclaimed king, and may remember you for good, your prayer uniting with the shofar blast to remind him." Here, then, the

service of Rosh Hashanah, consisting of certain recitations accompanying the sounding of the shofar, and expressive of the character of the day, is taken for granted; and just as the Rosh Hashanah service corresponded to the character of the day as a Day of Judgment, so did the peculiar ceremonials of the other sacred seasons, according to the rabbis, also imply divine judgment, within a certain sphere, on those seasons. It is needless to remark here that the other so-called seasons of judgment never impressed themselves as such upon the popular mind, while Rosh Hashanah assumed an even graver aspect, until it became one of the *yamin moraim*, "awful days."

When the first of Tishri had become the Biblical Day of the Sounding of the Shofar, which constituted the germinal element of the Day of Judgment, the first step had been taken toward the final fixing of the day as New Year's Day; for its importance was thus enhanced to a high degree. Certain historical events, the record

of which is found in the Bible, lent the month of Tishri and its first day additional significance. The great celebration at the dedication of Solomon's temple took place in the *month of the Ethanim*, on the Festival of Booths, which is the seventh month (1K. 8:2). The returned exiles under Zerubbabel began the sacrificial service on the restored altar at Jerusalem on the 1st of the 7th month (Ezra 3:6). And it was on the 1st of the 7th month that Ezra held a solemn convocation and read and explained the Law of Moses to the people, and those who grieved and wept when hearing the words of the Law were comforted by him with the words: "This day is holy to our Lord" (Neh. 8:10). Such events certainly produced a lasting impression upon the people's minds. It was thus that *pari passu*, with its development as a Day of Judgment, the 1st of Tishri was assuming its position as a New Year's Day, the month of Tishri first sharing this distinction with the old New

Year month, the month of Nisan, and later entirely supplanting it, and becoming the Rosh Hashanah *par excellence.*

(CONCLUDED.)

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 027 133 142 3